



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MAKING OF THE ROMAN PEOPLE, by Thomas Lloyd.
London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1914. Pp. vi + 136.
\$1.50 net.

The senior editor of *The Statist* has looked over the hedgerow and caught a glimpse of inviting pastures. In zeal that is unequally yoked together with knowledge, he essays to solve perplexing problems of linguistics and history with the theory that Latin is a corrupted form of Keltic. This view seems to him "to have been strangely overlooked or disregarded" (p. v), yet the singular indisposition "to accept the obvious explanation of the riddle" exists, he blithely assures us, "partly because fit (the explanation) is so very obvious, but, mainly, no doubt, because the modern intellect is still in bondage to Roman ideas" (p. 48).

The book opens with ingenious speculations regarding palaeolithic and neolithic man, and continues with a discussion of the Mediterranean or "Brown" race, as the author prefers to call it, in which he shows himself greatly impressed with its "intellectual superiority" (p. 3). We are thus in a measure prepared for the assertion that, with the solitary exception of the Greeks (and the author rather suspects that they "became inoculated with the ideas and the knowledge that they had not originated"), "the Aryans did not possess high qualities, whether intellectual, artistic, social, or political" (p. 63), those of the east being "a complete failure," and those of the west comparable at best "with the settled negro tribes of the centre of Africa." He thus proceeds to "the inevitable inference . . . that the Brown race stood higher in civilization than their white conquerors," and "the further conclusion that it is to the Brown element in the populations of Europe to which is mainly due the progress that Europe unquestionably has made in the past few hundred years" (pp. 58-63). Considerable pains are taken to prove that the Romans were neither Etruscans, nor Greeks, and the final conclusion is that they must have been a mixture of Gauls and the Brown race. (That the Romans might have been themselves, with as much right to speak an Indo-Germanic language as Greeks, or Gauls, or anyone else, seems not to have occurred to this searcher after origins.) The descendants of these Gauls became the Patricians, those of the Brown race the Plebeians, and the Latin language is that of the conquerors as modified by their subjects. It would, of course, be a sheer waste of words to point out the absurdities of such a theory; they are the more heinous, because this time a social scientist, and not a mere philologist, has sinned against the plainest light of history and reason.

The remainder of the book is devoted to marshalling "the philological evidence" for the author's portentous conclusions. If the first half of the book is irritating to the scholar, what follows can

be nothing but comical. Even the unsuspecting who may buy the book will be sure to get their money's worth of that none too common article, philological fun. Not that all the statements are wrong of course; on the contrary, a great many parallels are in essence correct enough, but, in rediscovering this mare's nest of similarity, Mr. Lloyd utterly transcends the limits of what his evidence will prove. I need hardly say that of the really significant points of identity, like the passive and deponent formations in *-r*, the subjunctive in *-ā-*, the nouns of agency in *-tion-*, there is never a word. A few samples of what is regarded as "philological evidence" will spare one the need of detailed criticism. Thus *Oidipos* (sic) is equated with *oidhche* (night); *tyrannus* is derived from *tigherna* (lord); *cogeo* (sic) from *cog* (make war); *timpanum* (sic) from *timpan* (a musical instrument); the adverbial *-im* as in *interim* from *am* (time); *bucolicus* from *buachaill*; *catus* from *cat* (cat); *treasaurus* (sic) from *stor*; *brum* (?) from *bromonach*; *bonus* from *ban* (white); *melior* from *míl* (honey); *malus* from *maol* (bare); *sylva* (sic) from *sliabh* (mountain chain); *toga* from *cota* by inversion, and the like. The following will serve as an illustration of the more formal argumentation:

"Many English visitors to Ireland . . . have heard . . . a . . . proverb originally Gaelic, and translated literally into English as follows: 'Life is precious, as the tailor said, and he running from the gander.' Now this extremely peculiar form of expression is used by one of the very greatest of Latin writers, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. It may be objected that the writer was a native of Gaelia Cis-Alpina. But he was also an exquisite poet. As such it is incredible that he would have employed in the greatest of his works a form of expression which would have shocked the ear or offended the taste of polite Rome. If that much be admitted, the form of expression could not have been unusual. If it was not, it is difficult to conceive any piece of evidence that would more clearly establish the Gaulish origin of the ruling class in Rome" (p. 84 f.).

No less redoubtable are some of the feats of explanation. Thus *sinn* and *sibh* (pronounced *siv*) are "manifestly identical" with *nos* and *vos*, for they "differ only because of the fact that the spelling is reversed in either the one language or the other" (p. 90 f.). Again it is found that the Latin paradigm should run *sum*, *est*, *es* in order to correspond to the modern Irish equivalents. Mr. Lloyd finds this just the "kind of change which might reasonably be expected" according to his theory, for "subjects finding it necessary to learn a conqueror's language, might very easily mistake 'thou art' for 'he is'" (p. 126). Furthermore "there cannot be a doubt that" *nihil* is derived from *n'il se* (is not), for "when the original Gaelic was forgotten, and the words had taken firm place in Latin, nothing would be more natural than that 'is not' should come to be used for 'nothing'" (p. 128). Particularly choice, however, is the new etymology proposed for French *oui*.

"One of the ways of saying 'it is' . . . would be in the affirmative *fuil se* or 'it is' . . . As Latin gained more and more ground upon Celtic, the origin of the word *fuil* would necessarily be forgotten, and the pronunciation might change somewhat. *Oi*, for example might take the place of *ui*. For that matter, even before Latin was introduced, the French Gaelic

speakers may have spelt the word with an *o*, while the Irish speakers spelt it with a *u*. In any event, the *f* would be dropped when its meaning was forgotten, and when *oil* came to be misconceived as a form of *ille*. Gradually, the *l* itself would be dropped, and *oui* would take the place of *fuil*. Here again we have decisive evidence of the permanent part played by Celtic in the formation of modern French" (p. 110 f.).

But enough of this. When one has had his laugh, the serious side claims attention. "Modern science," of which Mr. Lloyd talks glibly enough, has so far extended its range and refined its tools, that no amount of good will and ingenuity alone can hope to make substantial contributions. Nor is that all; the method is fundamentally at fault. In the preface to his "Theory of Distribution and Consumption" Mr. Lloyd takes the interesting position, that "political economy" "is a purely mental science"; that "it really concerns itself with subjective things, moods of the human mind." It is not for me to gainsay the validity of that contention for the science of economics, but one might observe that linguistic science is best treated objectively, and those results are most trustworthy which depend least upon the interpretation of "moods of the human mind," at least after the fashion in which the author of this work applies that method. Neither as history nor as philology has the book any scientific value whatsoever.

It is to be hoped that the lamentable failure of this preliminary study will induce the author, in his forthcoming book, "on the growth and decay of civilization, as exemplified by the history of Rome," to restrict himself to a discussion of the social and economic factors in Roman civilization within the framework of accepted history. In this field his professional attainments should lead one to expect really valuable results.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

The University of Illinois.

JELLINEK, M. H. GESCHICHTE DER NEUHOCH-DEUTSCHEN GRAMMATIK VON DEN ANFÄNGEN BIS AUF ADELUNG. (Germanische Bibliothek, II, 7, edited by Wilhelm Streitberg.) Heidelberg, I: 1913, x+392; II: 1914, xi+503.

The word "grammar," *γραμματική*, classicists will recollect, originally denoted merely the "science of letters," that by no means wide-spread faculty of reading and writing which in the time of Cæsar became synonymous with the newly-coined "litteratura." The concept of correct speaking did not form part of its definition, as it did later, cf. the "certa scribendi et loquendi ratio" of Melanchthon, the great preceptor of Germany. The office of the grammarian was singularly lofty and autocratic. He might perchance be a writer himself, a poet or a historian; but in his profes-